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**2014-2015 Methodology**

**Introduction of New Concepts**  
**Decision to Change Process**  
In early August 2013, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness met with the Vice President of Student Affairs and the Associate Vice President of Student Affairs to discuss the Non-Instructional Program Review process. In this meeting, a new review format was proposed and the new concept of a simplified program review process was introduced to the President’s Cabinet at the [8/20/13 Cabinet meeting](https://www.actx.edu/archives/filecabinet/2378). In this meeting, the Cabinet mandated that the current [PET form process](https://www.actx.edu/ie/pagesmith/75) be combined with the [old review process](https://www.actx.edu/ie/pagesmith/31) to create one new review process that was simplified compared to the previous review process, but that also focused on annual, non-instructional program outcomes.

**Process to Create the New Forms**  
On [9/11/13](https://www.actx.edu/archives/filecabinet/2487), the task of editing a new review form was introduced to the Non-Instructional (NI) Assessment Committee. After discussing what elements should be included on the new form, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness made edits based on the Committee feedback and then completed the new form as a pilot test. On [9/25/13](https://www.actx.edu/archives/filecabinet/2489), the Director of the Amarillo College Library completed the template and created a [Library NI review sample](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/497). Based on the library’s feedback and further review, the form and process was further refined on [11/6/13](https://www.actx.edu/archives/filecabinet/2488), [2/18/14](https://www.actx.edu/archives/filecabinet/2511), and [3/31/14](https://www.actx.edu/archives/filecabinet/2512) by the NI Assessment Committee and eventually evolved into [the form](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/495) that was used by NI areas beginning with the 2013-2014 year. The new instructional form was [first piloted with Nuclear Medicine](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/543) in 2013-2014, but was expanded to all instructional areas in 2014-2015: [Health Sciences](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/520), [Liberal Arts](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/519), [Nursing](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/520), [STEM](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/519), and [Technical Education](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/520).

**Focus**  
The [first-year focus](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/541) was that each NI area successfully complete each required section of the review and that one instructional pilot area (i.e. Nuclear Medicine) would test the form. The second-year (current) focus is expanding the new review process further into the instructional areas. The primary purpose of this form is to get both non-instructional and instructional areas to look at and evaluate their data and use their data to make improvements. As such, the Institutional Effectiveness office primarily focuses on ensuring programs and departments A) Participate in the process and B) Form outcomes that are used to make improvements.

**Communication to Non-Instructional (NI) and Instructional Areas**  
At the beginning of the new review cycle, the NI and Instructional areas initially received email communication reminding them to keep tracking outcomes and making improvements. Since the previous year’s focus was on non-instructional areas (over a dozen public training opportunities), the focus on the brand new process trainings this year moved to the instructional areas.

The Director of Institutional Effectiveness was invited to attend various meetings throughout the year to introduce the forms (e.g. The Health Sciences Back-to-School meeting, the math back-to-school department meeting, etc.) and also sent out various emails requesting people (both instructional and non-instructional) set up meetings with the Director of IE to set up trainings. At the meetings, the [basic agenda](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/578) focused on the expectations and how to complete the process. Emails [similar to last year](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/523) were sent to the AC body and one-on-one email communications continued with each individual throughout the duration of that year’s assessment cycle.

In addition, a [PowerPoint/handbook](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/496) and [checklist](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/526) was created for the NI areas to reference and use as a guide to complete their forms. For the instructional areas, a [PowerPoint was provided](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/580), but was not quite as explicit because the information that each division/program was requested from each area differed dependent on factors such as whether or not that program had a major code, that program was responsibility for core courses, etc. Instead, helpful hyperlinks and division/department workshops were provided to the instructional areas.

**Committees**

Historical records of the committees who assist with instructional efforts can be found on the [committee record list.](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/500)

**Closing the Loop**The deadline set for form submission was August 1, 2015. Each program is expected to “close their own loop” by providing a clear, evident plan for improvement based on their results. As an institution, programs/departments who did not meet the minimum expectations are given feedback and the opportunity to edit their forms. Themes are also noted and are used to make additional edits to the forms to ensure that future assessment forms meet the needs of the institution.

**Instructional Data**

Instructional programs were asked to complete the instructional review. The instructional review included an [evaluation of data](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/581), an analysis of the way the program aligns with institutional initiatives such as the [Strategic Plan](https://www.actx.edu/strategic/), and an analysis of outcomes that related to the program, the program’s [core curriculum courses](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/584), and/or both the program’s outcomes and the core curriculum courses.

**Program Assessment**

Any program that included a major code was asked to complete an evaluation of their programmatic data. The form submissions are located on the [Program Review Web page](https://www.actx.edu/archives/index.php?module=pagesmith&uop=view_page&id=37). The overall list of programs that did/did not submit and meet standards can be viewed by [visiting the 14-15 Programs Assessment tab](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/579).

In looking at all data (see by division breakdowns), it becomes evident that the STEM and Technical Education areas need the most assistance in completing their reports. Although some areas “did not meet expectation” based on what was submitted, the majority did not “meet expectation” simply because they did not submit a form.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Assessment Plan Data**  **All Academic Programs 2014-2015** | | | |
|  | **Met Expectation** | **Did Not Meet Expectation** | **Total Instructional Programs\*\*** |
| Programs Submitted Form  for Outcome Assessment | 43(77%) | 13 (23%) | 56 |
| Programs Submitted Outcome Data  (Results that Assess Outcome)\* | 39 (70%) | 17 (30%) |
| Programs Submitted Improvement Plan  Based on Outcome Data\* | 36 (64%) | 20 (36%) |
| \*If the program only partially met the requirement or if the evaluators were unsure if the requirement was met, the form was not given credit as having met the requirement. Also, forms that were not submitted were counted as not having met each requirement.  \*\*In many cases, multiple programs were grouped together by discipline for the purpose of submission. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Assessment Plan Data By Division**  **Academic Success 2014-2015** | | | |
|  | **Met Expectation** | **Did Not Meet Expectation** | **Total Instructional Programs\*\*** |
| Programs Submitted Form  for Outcome Assessment | 4(100%) | 0 (0%) | 4 |
| Programs Submitted Outcome Data  (Results that Assess Outcome)\* | 3 (75%) | 1 (25%) |
| Programs Submitted Improvement Plan  Based on Outcome Data\* | 3 (75%) | 1 (25%) |
| \*If the program only partially met the requirement or if the evaluators were unsure if the requirement was met, the form was not given credit as having met the requirement. Also, forms that were not submitted were counted as not having met each requirement.  \*\*In many cases, multiple programs were grouped together for the purposes of submission. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Assessment Plan Data By Division**  **Health Sciences 2014-2015** | | | |
|  | **Met Expectation** | **Did Not Meet Expectation** | **Total Instructional Programs\*\*** |
| Programs Submitted Form  for Outcome Assessment | 15 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 15 |
| Programs Submitted Outcome Data  (Results that Assess Outcome)\* | 13 (87%) | 2 (13%) |
| Programs Submitted Improvement Plan  Based on Outcome Data\* | 12 (80%) | 3 (20%) |
| \*If the program only partially met the requirement or if the evaluators were unsure if the requirement was met, the form was not given credit as having met the requirement. Also, forms that were not submitted were counted as not having met each requirement.  \*\*In many cases, multiple programs were grouped together for the purposes of submission. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Assessment Plan Data By Division**  **Liberal Arts 2014-2015** | | | |
|  | **Met Expectation** | **Did Not Meet Expectation** | **Total Instructional Programs\*\*** |
| Programs Submitted Form  for Outcome Assessment | 13 (81%) | 3 (19%) | 16 |
| Programs Submitted Outcome Data  (Results that Assess Outcome)\* | 13 (81%) | 3 (19%) |
| Programs Submitted Improvement Plan  Based on Outcome Data\* | 12 (75%) | 4 (25%) |
| \*If the program only partially met the requirement or if the evaluators were unsure if the requirement was met, the form was not given credit as having met the requirement. Also, forms that were not submitted were counted as not having met each requirement.  \*\*In many cases, multiple programs were grouped together for the purposes of submission. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Assessment Plan Data By Division**  **Nursing 2014-2015** | | | |
|  | **Met Expectation** | **Did Not Meet Expectation** | **Total Instructional Programs\*\*** |
| Programs Submitted Form  for Outcome Assessment | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| Programs Submitted Outcome Data  (Results that Assess Outcome)\* | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) |
| Programs Submitted Improvement Plan  Based on Outcome Data\* | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) |
| \*If the program only partially met the requirement or if the evaluators were unsure if the requirement was met, the form was not given credit as having met the requirement. Also, forms that were not submitted were counted as not having met each requirement.  \*\*In many cases, multiple programs were grouped together for the purposes of submission. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Assessment Plan Data By Division**  **STEM 2014-2015** | | | |
|  | **Met Expectation** | **Did Not Meet Expectation** | **Total Instructional Programs\*\*** |
| Programs Submitted Form  for Outcome Assessment | 5 (45%) | 6 (55%) | 11 |
| Programs Submitted Outcome Data  (Results that Assess Outcome)\* | 5 (45%) | 6 (55%) |
| Programs Submitted Improvement Plan  Based on Outcome Data\* | 5 (45%) | 6 (55%) |
| \*If the program only partially met the requirement or if the evaluators were unsure if the requirement was met, the form was not given credit as having met the requirement. Also, forms that were not submitted were counted as not having met each requirement.  \*\*In many cases, multiple programs were grouped together for the purposes of submission. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Assessment Plan Data By Division**  **Technical Education 2014-2015** | | | |
|  | **Met Expectation** | **Did Not Meet Expectation** | **Total Instructional Programs\*\*** |
| Programs Submitted Form  for Outcome Assessment | 4 (50%) | 4 (50%) | 8 |
| Programs Submitted Outcome Data  (Results that Assess Outcome)\* | 3 (36%) | 5 (63%) |
| Programs Submitted Improvement Plan  Based on Outcome Data\* | 2 (25%) | 6 (75%) |
| \*If the program only partially met the requirement or if the evaluators were unsure if the requirement was met, the form was not given credit as having met the requirement. Also, forms that were not submitted were counted as not having met each requirement.  \*\*In many cases, multiple programs were grouped together for the purposes of submission. | | | |

**Core Curriculum Assessment**

Any program that was primarily responsible for core curriculum courses was asked to complete an evaluation of their course data and to demonstrate alignment with the THECB competencies and evidence of using data to form improvements. These core curriculum assessments were conducted as part of the program assessment process. Programs who were also responsible for core classes, completed their assessment of the core courses that belong to their program [in the same assessment document as their program assessment](https://www.actx.edu/archives/index.php?module=pagesmith&uop=view_page&id=37).

The specific criteria that went into the initial forming of core curriculum proposals can be viewed on the [Core Curriculum Submission and Assessment Web site](https://www.actx.edu/ie/pagesmith/22), the assignment plans, benchmarks, assessment plans, etc. can be viewed on the [Core Submission Web site](http://www.actx.edu/courseproposal/), and the overall list of programs that did/did not submit and meet standards can be viewed by [visiting the 14-15 Core Curriculum Assessment tab](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/579).

In looking at all data (see by component area breakdown), it becomes evident that the STEM (core 20, core 20, and core 90 labs) need the most work as many of these areas did not submit their course assessment results and thus skewed the data.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Assessment Plan Data**  **All Core Curriculum 2014-2015** | | | |
|  | **Met Expectation** | **Did Not Meet Expectation** | **Total Core Curriculum Courses** |
| **Courses Submitted Form** | 61 (48%) | 66 (52%) | 126 |
| **Courses Submitted Results** | 59 (47%) | 68 (53%) |
| **Courses Met Benchmark** | 59 (47%) | 68 (53%) |
| **Courses Provided Information on Strategy, Evaluation, and Reliability** | 60 (48%) | 67 (52%) |
| **Courses Provided Result Analysis** | 54 (43%) | 72 (57%) |
| **Courses Provided Plan for Improvement** | 56 (44%) | 71 (56%) |
| **Note: If the course was noted as N/A, it was not counted as this course was not offered during the assessment period. However, if the course was evaluated as “Partial” or “Unsure” on meeting the criteria, it is counted as “Did Not Meet Expectations” for this table.** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Assessment Plan Data**  **Communication Foundational Component Area: Core 10**  **2014-2015** | | | |
|  | **Met Expectation** | **Did Not Meet Expectation** | **Total Core Curriculum Courses** |
| **Courses Submitted Form** | 3 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 3 |
| **Courses Submitted Results** |
| **Courses Met Benchmark** |
| **Courses Provided Information on Strategy, Evaluation, and Reliability** |
| **Courses Provided Result Analysis** |
| **Courses Provided Plan for Improvement** |
| **Note: If the course was noted as N/A, it was not counted as this course was not offered during the assessment period. However, if the course was evaluated as “Partial” or “Unsure” on meeting the criteria, it is counted as “Did Not Meet Expectations” for this table.** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Assessment Plan Data**  **Mathematics Foundational Component Area: Core 20**  **2014-2015** | | | |
|  | **Met Expectation** | **Did Not Meet Expectation** | **Total Core Curriculum Courses** |
| **Courses Submitted Form** | 0 (0%) | 9 (100%) | 9 |
| **Courses Submitted Results** |
| **Courses Met Benchmark** |
| **Courses Provided Information on Strategy, Evaluation, and Reliability** |
| **Courses Provided Result Analysis** |
| **Courses Provided Plan for Improvement** |
| **Note: If the course was noted as N/A, it was not counted as this course was not offered during the assessment period. However, if the course was evaluated as “Partial” or “Unsure” on meeting the criteria, it is counted as “Did Not Meet Expectations” for this table.** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Assessment Plan Data**  **Life & Physical Sciences Foundational Component Area: Core 30**  **2014-2015** | | | |
|  | **Met Expectation** | **Did Not Meet Expectation** | **Total Core Curriculum Courses** |
| **Courses Submitted Form** | 7 (19%) | 29 (81%) | 36 |
| **Courses Submitted Results** | 6 (17%) | 30 (83%) |
| **Courses Met Benchmark** | 6 (17%) | 30 (83%) |
| **Courses Provided Information on Strategy, Evaluation, and Reliability** | 7 (19%) | 29 (81%) |
| **Courses Provided Result Analysis** | 5 (14%) | 31 (86%) |
| **Courses Provided Plan for Improvement** | 7 (19%) | 29 (81%) |
| **Note: If the course was noted as N/A, it was not counted as this course was not offered during the assessment period. However, if the course was evaluated as “Partial” or “Unsure” on meeting the criteria, it is counted as “Did Not Meet Expectations” for this table.** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Assessment Plan Data**  **Language, Philosophy, & Culture Foundational Component Area: Core 40**  **2014-2015** | | | |
|  | **Met Expectation** | **Did Not Meet Expectation** | **Total Core Curriculum Courses** |
| **Courses Submitted Form** | 13 (57%) | 10 (43%) | 23 |
| **Courses Submitted Results** | 12 (52%) | 11 (48%) |
| **Courses Met Benchmark** | 12 (52%) | 11 (48%) |
| **Courses Provided Information on Strategy, Evaluation, and Reliability** | 12 (52%) | 11 (48%) |
| **Courses Provided Result Analysis** | 12 (52%) | 11 (48%) |
| **Courses Provided Plan for Improvement** | 12 (52%) | 11 (48%) |
| **Note: If the course was noted as N/A, it was not counted as this course was not offered during the assessment period. However, if the course was evaluated as “Partial” or “Unsure” on meeting the criteria, it is counted as “Did Not Meet Expectations” for this table.** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Assessment Plan Data**  **Creative Arts Foundational Component Area: Core 50**  **2014-2015** | | | |
|  | **Met Expectation** | **Did Not Meet Expectation** | **Total Core Curriculum Courses** |
| **Courses Submitted Form** | 15 (88%) | 2 (12%) | 17 |
| **Courses Submitted Results** | 15 (88%) | 2 (12%) |
| **Courses Met Benchmark** | 15 (88%) | 2 (12%) |
| **Courses Provided Information on Strategy, Evaluation, and Reliability** | 15 (88%) | 2 (12%) |
| **Courses Provided Result Analysis** | 11 (65%) | 6 (35%) |
| **Courses Provided Plan for Improvement** | 11 (65%) | 6 (35%) |
| **Note: If the course was noted as N/A, it was not counted as this course was not offered during the assessment period. However, if the course was evaluated as “Partial” or “Unsure” on meeting the criteria, it is counted as “Did Not Meet Expectations” for this table.** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Assessment Plan Data**  **American History Foundational Component Area: Core 60**  **2014-2015** | | | |
|  | **Met Expectation** | **Did Not Meet Expectation** | **Total Core Curriculum Courses** |
| **Courses Submitted Form** | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| **Courses Submitted Results** |
| **Courses Met Benchmark** |
| **Courses Provided Information on Strategy, Evaluation, and Reliability** |
| **Courses Provided Result Analysis** |
| **Courses Provided Plan for Improvement** |
| **Note: If the course was noted as N/A, it was not counted as this course was not offered during the assessment period. However, if the course was evaluated as “Partial” or “Unsure” on meeting the criteria, it is counted as “Did Not Meet Expectations” for this table.** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Assessment Plan Data**  **Government/Political Science Foundational Component Area: Core 70**  **2014-2015** | | | |
|  | **Met Expectation** | **Did Not Meet Expectation** | **Total Core Curriculum Courses** |
| **Courses Submitted Form** | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| **Courses Submitted Results** |
| **Courses Met Benchmark** |
| **Courses Provided Information on Strategy, Evaluation, and Reliability** |
| **Courses Provided Result Analysis** |
| **Courses Provided Plan for Improvement** |
| **Note: If the course was noted as N/A, it was not counted as this course was not offered during the assessment period. However, if the course was evaluated as “Partial” or “Unsure” on meeting the criteria, it is counted as “Did Not Meet Expectations” for this table.** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Assessment Plan Data**  **Social and Behavioral Sciences Foundational Component Area: Core 80**  **2014-2015** | | | |
|  | **Met Expectation** | **Did Not Meet Expectation** | **Total Core Curriculum Courses** |
| **Courses Submitted Form** | 16 (84%) | 3 (16%) | 19 |
| **Courses Submitted Results** |
| **Courses Met Benchmark** |
| **Courses Provided Information on Strategy, Evaluation, and Reliability** |
| **Courses Provided Result Analysis** |
| **Courses Provided Plan for Improvement** |
| **Note: If the course was noted as N/A, it was not counted as this course was not offered during the assessment period. However, if the course was evaluated as “Partial” or “Unsure” on meeting the criteria, it is counted as “Did Not Meet Expectations” for this table.** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Assessment Plan Data**  **Component Area Option Foundational Component Area: Core 90**  **2014-2015** | | | |
|  | **Met Expectation** | **Did Not Meet Expectation** | **Total Core Curriculum Courses** |
| **Courses Submitted Form** | 3 (20%) | 12 (80%) | 15 |
| **Courses Submitted Results** |
| **Courses Met Benchmark** |
| **Courses Provided Information on Strategy, Evaluation, and Reliability** |
| **Courses Provided Result Analysis** |
| **Courses Provided Plan for Improvement** |
| **Note: If the course was noted as N/A, it was not counted as this course was not offered during the assessment period. However, if the course was evaluated as “Partial” or “Unsure” on meeting the criteria, it is counted as “Did Not Meet Expectations” for this table.** | | | |

**Overall Findings**

For institutional effectiveness, the goal is typically set that 80% of programs will submit the required assessment forms and in doing so will demonstrate outcomes, results related to the outcomes, and plans for improvement based on the analysis of the outcomes. Since this year involved the first time this form was widely distributed, we expected that the response rates would be somewhat lower than the desired benchmark, but we found that for both program outcomes and core curriculum outcomes it is primarily the STEM and Technical Education that need to receive the most focused support moving forward.